

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of this application. Claims 2-11 have been rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks submitted in support thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph:

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and to use the invention. For the reasons put forth below, Applicant respectfully asserts that the specification describes the subject matter in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and to use the invention.

The Examiner notes that the specification fails to disclose a resource adapter and a computer program product comprising: java classes and interfaces; native libraries; meta information; a deployment descriptor; multiple property sets; how the resource adapter is packaged; and how the components of the adapter functionally interact with each other.

With regard to java classes, java interfaces, and native libraries, the Applicant points to page 4, lines 3-5 in the detailed description for support. Furthermore, Java (an object-oriented programming language), Java classes (a category of objects), Java interfaces (languages and codes that applications use to communicate with each other and with hardware), and native libraries (collection of precompiled routines) are terms well-known by one skilled in the art.

With regard to the meta information, Applicant points to page 5, lines 20-21 in the detailed description for support. With regard to the deployment descriptor, Applicant directs the Examiner to page 4, lines 9-10 and page 6, lines 1-5 in the detailed description for

support. With regard to the multiple property sets, Applicant points to page 8, lines 14-22 in the detailed description for support. With regard to how the resource adapter is packaged, Applicant directs the Examiner to: page 2, lines 14-20; page 4, lines 12-18; and page 5, lines 4-21 in the summary and detailed description for support. With regard to how the components of the adapter functionally interact with each other, the Applicant points to pages 5-8 and page 10, lines 3-16 in the detailed description for support.

Reference is also made to the exemplary source code to implement an embodiment of the invention, as listed on pages 13-20 in the detailed description, with step-by-step explanation of the source code. As such, the Applicant submits that claims 2-11 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph because the above-referenced terms used in claims 2-11 have clear support in the description such that the meaning of the terms is ascertainable by reference to the description. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph:

The Examiner also has rejected claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. In particular, the Examiner notes that there are no functional relationships between the components. Although the Applicant believes that appropriate interrelation of elements is provided, in an effort to provide more clarity, the Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define the functional relationships between the components. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that claims 7-11 are indefinite because the claims recite a program product having components instead of method steps. Although the Applicant believes that appropriate method steps are provided, in an effort to provide more clarity, the Applicant has

amended the claims to clearly define the method steps. In view of these amendments, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending amended claims 2-11 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900 ext. 6924. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP148). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.



Michael K. Hsu, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,782

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 25920